

The New Constantine and the New Constantinople – 1261?

Ruth Macrides

To cite this article: Ruth Macrides (1980) The New Constantine and the New Constantinople – 1261?, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 6:1, 13-41

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/030701380806931560>



Published online: 20 Nov 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 79



View related articles [↗](#)

The New Constantine and the New Constantinople – 1261?

RUTH MACRIDES

On 15 August 1261 the emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos, born, raised, and crowned in 'exile' during the Latin occupation of Constantinople, entered the newly reconquered capital for the first time.¹ Michael carefully planned the ceremonial surrounding his entrance into Constantinople, choosing as his day of entry the feast day of the Dormition of the Virgin, the City's protectress, and giving her icon, known as the Hodegetria, a place of honour in the celebrations. The entire day's programme was intended as a thanksgiving to God rather than a celebration of an imperial triumph. Preceded by the icon of the Hodegetria, the emperor walked through the Golden Gate, relinquishing his prerogative to ride in a quadriga through the gate which had received emperors returning

1. Michael Doukas Angelos Komnenos Palaiologos was born about 1225, probably in Asia Minor. See D. I. Polemis, *The Doukai: A Contribution to Byzantine Prosopography* (London, 1968), pp. 157–8; D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1959), p. 17 and notes; pp. 33–46; M. Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 80–93. For autobiographical details see Michael's *typika* for the monasteries of St. Demetrios (ed. H. Grégoire, 'Imperatoris Michaelis Palaeologi de vita sua', *B*, XXIX–XXX (1959–60), 449–51) and the Archangel Michael (ed. Dmitrievski, *Opisanie Liturgicheskikh Rukopisei*, I [Kiev, 1895], p. 790). On the background to the recovery of Constantinople see Geanakoplos, *op. cit.*, pp. 79–115; Angold, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–93; D. M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium* (London, 1972), pp. 23–41.

triumphant from campaign.² In other words, Michael's entry was conducted *θεοπρεπῶς μᾶλλον ἢ βασιλικῶς*.³

Only one element was missing from this celebration – the presence of the patriarch. Arsenios had been detained at Skoutari on the Asiatic shore, prevented from making the journey to Constantinople until he agreed to certain demands.⁴ However, sometime after 15 August Arsenios joined the others and was received in a cleaned and refurbished Hagia Sophia.⁵ Again, at some later point, Arsenios crowned Michael in Hagia Sophia.⁶

2. Akropolites, ed. A. Heisenberg, *Georgii Acropolitae Opera*, I (Leipzig, 1903), p. 187, 26–7, also pp. 186–7; Pachymeres (*CSHB*), I, pp. 159–62; Gregoras (*CSHB*), I, p. 87, 14–20. For the Virgin as Constantinople's protectress see N. H. Baynes, 'The Supernatural Defenders of Constantinople', in Baynes, *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955), pp. 248ff.; Averil Cameron, 'The Theotokos in Sixth-Century Constantinople', *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXIX (1978), 79ff. On the role of the icon of the Hodegetria in the religious life of Constantinople see R. L. Wolff, 'Footnote to an Incident of the Latin Occupation of Constantinople: The Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria', *Traditio*, VI (1948), 319–28. A lead seal depicting Michael holding an icon of the Virgin and Child above his head is thought to be a representation of Michael's procession into the city with the Hodegetria icon. See G. Zacos and A. Vegliery, *Byzantine Lead Seals*, I, 3 (Basel, 1972), plate 2756 bis and pp. 1579–81; also note 55 below.

3. The emphasis placed on thanksgiving to God in the ceremony surrounding the entry is typical of the manner in which Michael presents his whole career. See Geanakoplos in *Essays presented to George Huntston Williams*, ed. F. Church and T. George (Leiden, 1979), pp. 104 ff.; 'de vita sua', ed. Grégoire, *B*, XXIX–XXX (1959–60), 451, 453, 457; also the comments of H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I (Munich, 1978), pp. 167–8.

4. Arsenios, *Testamentum* in *MPG*, CXL, col. 953; Akropolites, ed. Heisenberg, p. 187, 6–10.

5. Akropolites, p. 188, 8–18. The exact date of Arsenios' arrival in Constantinople is not known. See Pachymeres, I, pp. 172–3, for the repairs to Hagia Sophia; also T. F. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park, Pennsylvania/London, 1971), p. 97, who, however, mistakenly attributes the work of renovation to Arsenios.

6. Michael's coronation has been dated to the end of August, or September 1261. See, e.g. F. Dölger, 'Die dynastische Familienpolitik des Kaisers Michael Palaiologos (1258–1282)', *Festschrift E. Eichmann zum 70. Geburtstag* (Paderborn, 1940), p. 181, reprinted in *ΠΑΡΑΣΠΟΡΑ* (Ettal, 1961); Angold, op. cit., p. 91; G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (Oxford, 1968), p. 450; Geanakoplos, op. cit., p. 121. However, these are conjectures; a date anytime within the period 15 August–25 December 1261 is possible. See below, p. 17 and note 16. This was Michael's second coronation. For the first,

In the fifty-seven years of Latin occupation the city's population had declined and its appearance deteriorated.⁷ The emperor therefore set out to have it cleaned and rebuilt where necessary; in short, to restore the city to a functioning capital. He is said to have built or repaired churches, monasteries, theatres, baths, hospitals and many other edifices. No wonder he was regarded as a second founder of the city, a New Constantine.

Our knowledge of Michael's work of restoration in the capital is derived from encomiasts (Manuel Holobolos, Gregory of Cyprus) and historians (Pachymeres, Gregoras), writing during and after Michael's reign.⁸ However, as is the case with other events in Michael's reign, the chronology is far from clear. While the works of these authors present Michael's building programme within the context and chronological framework of his reoccupation of the capital, they give no idea of the length of time involved. If anything, they imply that all the work of restoration was accomplished in a sudden intense burst of activity in the first few months after Michael's entry into the city. This leaves us with a highly artificial and unsatisfactory idea of Michael's programme of reconstruction, although not one which the emperor himself would have found disappointing.⁹

Three orations addressed to the emperor Michael by Manuel Holobolos¹⁰ are of particular interest in establishing a more

at Nicaea in 1259, see Akropolites, p. 159, 15–18; Pachymeres, I, pp. 103–5; P. Wirth, 'Die Begründung der Kaisermacht Michaels VIII. Palaiologos', *JÖBG*, X (1961), 87–9.

7. Gregoras (*CSHB*), I, p. 81, 8–11; pp. 87, 23–88, 16; Pachymeres, I, p. 161, 7–13.

8. Manuel Holobolos: ed. M. Treu, *Manuelis Holoboli orationes*, I–II, Programm des königlichen Victoria-Gymnasiums zu Potsdam (Potsdam, 1906–7); Gregory of Cyprus: *Encomium*, ed. J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, I (Paris, 1829), p. 349; also in *MPG*, CXLII, cols. 376–7; Pachymeres, I, pp. 172–3; 186–8; Gregoras, I, p. 88, 12–15.

9. See Michael's own account in his chrysobull for Hagia Sophia: *JGR*, I, p. 665.

10. The main source for Holobolos' life is Pachymeres, I, pp. 282–4; 374; 392–4; II, 25, 90. For a discussion of his career and extant writings see especially M. Treu, 'Manuel Holobolos', *BZ*, V (1896), 538–59; idem, *Eustathii Macrembolitae quae feruntur aenigmata*, Programm des königl. Friedrichs-

precise understanding of this period in Michael's reign. The orations, which are linked together by internal references and were obviously intended to form a series,¹¹ deal with (1) events in Michael's early reign in Asia Minor;¹² (2) the reconquest and entry into Constantinople;¹³ (3) Michael's proclamation as emperor and coronation in Constantinople; his building activities and establishment of educational facilities at a secondary and higher level.¹⁴ They are extraordinary in their wealth of detail and in fact contain more information about Michael's reconstruction programme than any other source. However, the date which has been assigned to them (25 December 1261)¹⁵ makes it necessary to ascribe a great deal of their contents to rhetorical exaggeration. Michael would have had to have accomplished all that Holobolos attributes to him in the four months between his entry into the city in mid-August 1261 and Christmas day 1261.

Obviously, then, the date of delivery of Holobolos' orations is crucial to a proper understanding and evaluation of Michael's activities as a second founder of Constantinople. If they were delivered in 1261, their contents are not useful in forming a more precise idea of Michael's actual programme. If, however, they belong to a different time, their new context can provide some insight into the reconstruction process and the development of the restored capital.

gymnasiums zu Breslau (Breslau, 1893), pp. 23–9; A. Heisenberg, *Aus der Geschichte und Literatur der Palaiologenzeit*, Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Munich, 1920), 112–32; S. Kourouses, *Ἀθηνᾶ*, LXXV (1974–5), 347ff.; 355–6 for full biography.

11. The second oration contains a summary of the subject of a future, third oration (ed. Treu, p. 77, 15–31); the third, a reference to the first and second orations (p. 80, 29–30) and to the fact that it is the third and last oration (p. 98, 5).

12. Ed. Treu, pp. 30–50. This oration was also published by X. A. Siderides in *EEBS*, III (1926), 174–91.

13. Ed. Treu, pp. 51–77.

14. Ed. Treu, pp. 78–98.

15. See Dölger, *Festschrift Eichmann*, pp. 187–8. His dating has been accepted by L. Previale, 'Un Panegirico inedito per Michele VIII Paleologo', *BZ*, XLII (1943–9), 5, note 6; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael*, p. 93, note 5; P. Wirth, *JÖBG*, X (1961), 86–7.

25 December 1261 is one of the few precise dates which we have for the first months of Michael's reign in Constantinople. According to Pachymeres, it was on this day that the young John Laskaris, son of Michael's predecessor on the throne, Theodore II Laskaris, was blinded by order of Michael Palaiologos.¹⁶ By this act Michael ensured his position as sole legitimate ruler. Pachymeres states that Michael took this extreme step after Arsenios crowned him emperor in Hagia Sophia.¹⁷ He then proceeds to say that Manuel Holobolos, a boy who was then a *grammatikos* or secretary in the emperor's service,¹⁸ was punished for showing great distress at this treatment of John; his punishment was mutilation of his nose and lips. Immediately thereafter Holobolos withdrew to a monastery.¹⁹ Thus, he left public life sometime after Christmas 1261.

25 December 1261 is also the date which Dölger and others have assigned to the delivery of the series of three orations by Holobolos.²⁰ Presumably this date was chosen because the *lemma* to the second of the three orations claims that the oration

16. Pachymeres, I, pp. 191, 13–192, 8. On this passage see now A. Failler, 'La tradition manuscrite de l'Histoire de Georges Pachymère (Livres I–VI)', *REB*, XXXVII (1979), p. 154–6. For the date see Pachymeres, I, p. 192, 7–8: *κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἐορτῆς τοῦ Σωτήρος, καθ' ἣν ἄρα καὶ ἐγεννήθη*. This expression implies that John was blinded on Christmas day which was also his birthday. Nikephoros Blemmydes wrote a poem on the occasion of John's birth which compares John's mother to the Virgin, John to Christ and the poet to one of the Magi bearing a gift: ed. A. Heisenberg, *Nicephori Blemmydae Curriculum Vitae et Carmina* (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 110–11. See also Polemis, *The Doukai*, p. 111. The year of his blinding must be 1261 because Arsenios says that three years after he learned of John's blinding he banned Michael from the church: *MPG*, CXL, col. 956; also note 40 below. Since Arsenios was deposed in 1264 (see V. Laurent, 'La chronologie des patriarches de Constantinople au XIII^e siècle (1208–1309)', *REB*, XXVII (1969), 142), soon after he took this step, the blinding must have taken place in 1261.

17. Pachymeres, I, pp. 190, 16–191, 14.

18. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 192, 20–193, 1.

19. *Ibid.*, I, p. 193, 1–4; p. 393, 7–10. The form of punishment was not uncommon in Michael's reign. See Pachymeres, I, p. 487, 12, 14; p. 493, 2. The mutilation could not have seriously impaired Holobolos' speech because he later had a career as a teacher. See below, p. 26. For Holobolos' place of monastic exile, the Prodromos monastery in Constantinople (Petra) see W. Hörandner, 'Miscellanea Epigrammatica', *JÖB*, XIX (1970), 116–19.

20. See above, note 15.

was delivered on Christmas day.²¹ Dölger and those who accept his dating assume that the Christmas day in question was in 1261 because all three orations refer to events of 1261; the latest event mentioned is Michael's coronation in Hagia Sophia,²² assumed to have taken place in August or September of 1261.²³ Therefore, a date before 1261 is impossible. Likewise, according to this argument, a date after 1261 would not be plausible because the events celebrated by the orations would have been out of date by then. Besides, Holobolos was in disgrace shortly after Christmas 1261.

However, there are several problems with this argument. First of all, why should all three orations have been delivered on the same day? The orations themselves give quite specific chronological indications which should be taken into account. Holobolos refers to the passing of time between the delivery of each oration. In the second oration he states that the first was delivered some time ago in the past year. Again, he explicitly states that a year has passed between the delivery of the second and third orations.²⁴ Also, he refers to one of his orations as 'annual tribute'.²⁵ In addition, at the beginning of each oration Holobolos summarizes what he said in the previous one – an indication that enough time has passed to make a review of the contents necessary.²⁶

Given the internal evidence, then, the orations could not have been delivered on one day or even on three consecutive days. This immediately poses a problem for a 1261 date. For if the orations were separated by intervals of approximately one year, as the evidence suggests, the delivery of the orations would have extended from 1261 (the earliest possible date for the orations) into the period when Holobolos was in disgrace.

Furthermore, there is the question of Holobolos' position at

21. Ed. Treu, p. 51.

22. Ed. Treu, p. 77, 15–20; pp. 93, 5–94, 27.

23. See note 6 above.

24. Ed. Treu, p. 52, 17–18: *ὁ μὲν οὖν πρῶτος ἐκεῖνος λόγος . . . ὃν κατὰ τὸν παριππεύσαντα νῦν ἡλίον κατεθέμην*; p. 79, 11–12: *ὅπερ ἐπηγγειλάμην κατὰ τὸ παριππεύσαν ἔτος ἔγγραφον*.

25. Ibid., p. 78, 5–6: *τὸν λογικὸν ἐπέτειον φόρον*; see also, p. 51, 27–28: *εἰς μίαν τοῦ ἔτους ἡμέραν*.

26. Ibid., p. 52, 27ff.; p. 80, 29ff.

the time he delivered the orations. From Pachymeres it is known that Holobolos was a *grammatikos* in 1261.²⁷ But the *lemmata* to the orations describe him as a *ρήτωρ τῶν ρητόρων*.²⁸ Holobolos did not hold this title until 1265/1266 when the patriarch Germanos III obtained the emperor's permission to recall Holobolos from his monastic exile.²⁹

The evidence presented above suggests that Holobolos' orations for Michael Palaiologos could not have been delivered in 1261. Given the facts of Holobolos' career, the earliest possible date for their delivery would have been the years 1265–1266–1267.³⁰ As will become apparent, the change in date must be accompanied by a change in patronage. The orations should be transferred from the context of Michael's first few months in Constantinople to that of Germanos' patriarchate³¹ four years later. Furthermore, these changes in date and context will have implications for Church-State relations and for Michael's programme of reconstruction.

The significance of Germanos' short patriarchate (1265–6)³² can best be understood when compared with that of Arsenios (1254–60; 1261–4)³³ which it followed. Relations between Michael Palaiologos and Arsenios had been troubled from the beginning. Arsenios was appointed patriarch under Theodore II Laskaris at Nicaea in 1254.³⁴ Thus Michael inherited him as patriarch and had to contend with the man's loyalty to the

27. See above, note 18.

28. Ed. Treu, pp. 30, 51, 78. The *lemmata* to the second and third orations are genuine. In his *apparatus criticus* to the first oration (p. 30) Treu informs the reader, *titulum orationis addidi*.

29. See below, p. 26.

30. See note 137 below.

31. Treu (*Manuelis Holoboli orationes*, p. 98) dated the orations to the period of Germanos' patriarchate, presumably because of the title *ρήτωρ τῶν ρητόρων* which is attributed to Holobolos in the *lemmata*.

32. For the redating of Germanos' patriarchate from 1267 to 1265–6 see J. Sykoutres, *Συνοδικὸς τόμος τῆς ἐκλογῆς τοῦ πατριάρχου Γερμανοῦ τοῦ Γ'* (1265–1266), *EEBS*, IX (1932), 178–212; V. Laurent, *REB*, XXVII (1969), 143–4.

33. See Laurent, *op. cit.*, pp. 139–40; 142–3.

34. On Arsenios and his election see Akropolites, pp. 106–7; Skoutariotes, ed. Heisenberg, *Additamenta ad Georgii Acropolitae Historiam* (in Heisenberg's edition of Akropolites' *History*), pp. 288–91; J. Sykoutres, *Περὶ τὸ σχῆμα τῶν Ἀρσενιατῶν*, *Ἑλληνικά*, II (1929), 270–4.

Laskaris family, particularly to Theodore's young son John whom Theodore had designated his successor in his will.³⁵ It was the conflict between Arsenios' role as protector of John and duty as patriarch to Michael, a usurper, which caused difficulties. A year after he crowned Michael emperor in Nicaea, Arsenios retreated to a monastery.³⁶ A new patriarch, Nikephoros, was elected, thus causing a schism in the Church between supporters of the new patriarch and those who believed Arsenios to be the rightful patriarch.³⁷ Although Arsenios was restored to his See after Nikephoros' death, Michael stipulated that he must acknowledge Nikephoros' ecclesiastical appointments.³⁸ According to Arsenios, the emperor would not allow him to enter the newly reconquered Constantinople until he had agreed to this demand.³⁹ Relations between emperor and patriarch were finally disrupted when Arsenios learned of John Laskaris' blinding. He excommunicated Michael and, three years later, when he saw that the emperor showed no sign of repenting in a manner acceptable to him, he forbade him to enter Hagia Sophia.⁴⁰ Shortly thereafter Michael had him deposed, exiled and excommunicated.⁴¹

35. Akropolites, p. 154, 10ff.; Arsenios, *Testamentum*, MPG, CXL, cols. 949–52; Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile*, pp. 88–9.

36. Pachymeres, I, pp. 111–12; Gregoras, I, p. 80, 11–17; Arsenios, MPG, CXL, col. 953.

37. Akropolites, pp. 176–180; Pachymeres, I, pp. 118–20; Arsenios, MPG, CXL, col. 953; Laurent, *REB*, XXVII (1969), 140–2; Sykoutres, *Ἑλληνικά*, II (1929), pp. 282–9.

38. Arsenios, MPG, CXL, col. 953; Pachymeres, I, pp. 171–2.

39. Arsenios, MPG, CXL, col. 953 C.

40. Arsenios does not appear to have excommunicated Michael completely in 1261 but only in 1264. See Arsenios (MPG, CXL, col. 956 A): τῷ ἀφορισμῷ αὐτὸν καθυπέβαλον . . . μετὰ τριετίαν . . . ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦτον ἐξέβαλον; also Pachymeres, I, pp. 201–4; Gregoras, I, p. 93, 17–22.

41. Arsenios, MPG, CXL, col. 956 B; Pachymeres, I, pp. 257–71; 285–9; V. Laurent, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, I, 4 (Paris, 1971), N. 1376 (1265). Although the emperor won the battle in life, Arsenios and John Laskaris fared better after death. Russian travellers to Constantinople in the fourteenth century mention visiting the tombs of St. Arsenios and St. Laskarijasaf: see I. Ševčenko, 'Notes on Stephen, the Novgorodian Pilgrim to Constantinople in the XIV century', *Südost-Forschungen*, XII (1953), 173–5; G. P. Majeska, 'St. Sophia in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: The Russian Travelers on the Relics', *DOP*, XXVII (1973), 83–4. Whereas Arsenios' body was displayed in a coffin to the left of the sanctuary in Hagia Sophia,

After a vacancy in the patriarchal throne of one year,⁴² Germanos, a man noted for his simplicity of manner and excellence of character, was elected.⁴³ He had a good record as a monk in Asia Minor⁴⁴ and had received his ecclesiastical training under the patriarch Germanos II (1223–1240).⁴⁵ During the reign of the emperor John Batatzes he was appointed to the metropolitan see of Adrianople, where he served at least fifteen years⁴⁶ before he was translated to the patriarchal

Michael VIII's body was never buried in Constantinople but remained in the monastery of the Saviour in Selymbria, near his place of death. Philotheos, Metropolitan of Selymbria in the fourteenth century, comments that the emperor's body lay bloated because of the excommunication which the patriarch Arsenios had pronounced against him. See P. Magdalino, 'Byzantine Churches of Selymbria', *DOP*, XXXII (1978), 348–9 and notes.

42. See Laurent, *REB*, XXVII (1969), 142–4.

43. See Pachymeres, I, pp. 278–80, who is also the main source for Germanos' career. According to him, Germanos was a Gabras (I, p. 282, 10–11). However, his name does not appear in E. Trapp, *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* (Vienna, 1977), Fasc. 2, nor in either of the prosopographical studies devoted to the Gabras family: A. Bryer, *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, XII (1970), 164–87; A. Bryer, St. Fassoulakis, D. M. Nicol, *BS*, XXXVI (1975), 38–45. Instead, the name Markoutzas is given to him as a surname: see Laurent, *Les Regestes*, p. 176. Again according to Pachymeres (I, p. 282, 8–10), this was a Turkish nickname given to Germanos because of his Anatolian origins. It appears in different forms: Pachymeres, I, p. 282, 8: *Μαρμουτζᾶς*; cod. Vatic. Chis. 54: *Μαλκουτζᾶς*. See A. Failler's comments on the name in *REB*, XXXVII (1979), 287–8.

44. Pachymeres, I, p. 280, 9–11; p. 402, 9–11; Gregoras, I, p. 95, 13–14; George Metochites, ed. A. Mai, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae*, VIII (Rome, 1871), p. 32; see also note 50. For conjectures as to the location of *Μέλαν Ὀρὸς* the place of Germanos' monastic retreat, see J. Sykoutres, *Ἑλληνικά*, II (1929), 301; K. Amantos, *Σύμμεικτα*, *Ἑλληνικά*, I (1928), 405.

45. Pachymeres, I, p. 282, 15–16.

46. See Germanos' 'Inaugural Address' to the clergy of Hagia Sophia where he refers to his appointment to the see of Adrianople under Batatzes: *Λόγος κατηχητικός*, ed. Treu, *Manuelis Holoboli orationes*, p. 2, 26–8; also George Metochites, ed. Mai, op. cit., p. 32, for Germanos' long stay in Adrianople. His appointment there dates at least from 1250: see Laurent, *EO*, XXXVIII (1939), 22; *EO*, XXXIII (1934), 24. See also the two letters addressed to him as Metropolitan of Adrianople by Theodore Laskaris in c. 1254–5: N. Festa, ed., *Theodori Ducae Lascaris Epistulae CCXVII* (Florence, 1898), pp. 181–5; for the date of the first letter see F. Dölger–P. Wirth, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches*, I, 3 (Munich, 1977), p. v, note 1 and N. 1823a.

throne.⁴⁷ Although he was not himself a learned man⁴⁸ he respected scholars and was interested in reviving old ecclesiastical customs.⁴⁹ In Michael's eyes he was a most suitable candidate for the patriarchal throne because he had supported the emperor at the beginning of his reign in Asia Minor.⁵⁰ Michael was anxious to see him appointed and did his utmost to speed the election along.⁵¹

Germanos' patriarchate was a period of good, even warm, relations between emperor and patriarch.⁵² Evidence of mutual goodwill is supplied by Pachymeres who is well-informed on ecclesiastical matters. He tells us of a *peplos* Germanos commissioned, a textile which represented Michael as the New

47. See J. Sykoutres, *EEBS*, IX (1932), 178–212 and the review of this article by Dölger in *BZ*, XXXIII (1933), 202. Germanos' translation from Adrianople to Constantinople was considered uncanonical in some circles: see Pachymeres, I, p. 290, 13–17; Sykoutres, *op. cit.*, p. 194. The wording of the synodal tome on his election to the patriarchal throne reflects the need to win people over to the synod's decision.

48. Pachymeres, I, p. 279, 8–11; *Λόγος κατηχητικός*, ed. Treu, *Manuelis Holoboli orationes*, p. 1, 16–18; Failler, *REB*, XXXVII (1979), 140.

49. Pachymeres, I, p. 282, 16–18; below, pp. 26–7.

50. Gregoras, I, p. 95, 8–19, claims that Germanos and Michael were old friends, having met at the time of Michael's flight to the Turks (1256: see below, p. 32) when Germanos was a monk in Asia Minor. Although Pachymeres (I, p. 280, 8–11; p. 402, 9–11) confirms that Germanos was a monk in Asia Minor, this would seem to have been at an earlier stage in his career, before he was appointed to Adrianople: see note 46 above. However, there is some evidence that Germanos and Michael were old friends. According to Pachymeres (I, p. 102, 1–9), Germanos was instrumental in persuading Arsenios to crown Michael emperor in Nicaea in 1259. This must have endeared Germanos to Michael: see Pachymeres, I, p. 279, 2.

51. Pachymeres, I, p. 280, 12–15.

52. None the less, it was not until the patriarchate of Joseph (1266–75) that Arsenios' excommunication of Michael was formally lifted. See Laurent, *Les Regestes*, N. 1386 (1267). This delay was not due to Germanos' unwillingness to pardon the emperor. Rather, it seems that Joseph, jealous of Germanos' sudden rise to the patriarchal throne from a relatively humble position, persuaded the emperor that Germanos would not be able to carry off the absolution successfully, and brought about Germanos' resignation. See Pachymeres, I, pp. 290–307, esp. pp. 290–1. However, Michael and Germanos continued to be on good terms. The former patriarch served Michael as an ambassador (1271/2: Hungary; 1274: Lyons). See Pachymeres, I, pp. 318, 384; Dölger-Wirth, *Regesten*, N. 1982, N. 2006.

Constantine.⁵³ The *peplos* hung between two porphyry columns at the west end of the church of Hagia Sophia.⁵⁴

This representation of Michael was the visual counterpart of the epithet *νέος Κωνσταντῖνος* which appears in various sources for Michael's reign, both Greek and Latin.⁵⁵ The earliest dated

53. Pachymeres, II, p. 614, 13–16. Pachymeres' description does not indicate whether Michael was represented in scenes showing him as the second founder of the city or whether he was simply portrayed with an inscription labelling him the New Constantine. But see Pachymeres, II, p. 615, 1–2, where the patriarch Athanasios (1289–93; 1303–9) is said to have changed the representation of Michael 'to the appearance (*σχῆμα*) of the most renowned Constantine'. It is not clear what kind of a change Athanasios could have made, apart from an alteration to an inscription, because there was no fixed iconographic type for Constantine the Great. Compare the mosaic in the lunette of the southwest vestibule with that in the room over the vestibule in Hagia Sophia and see the comments of R. Cormack and E. J. W. Hawkins, 'The Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul: The Rooms above the Southwest Vestibule and Ramp', *DOP*, XXXI (1977), 240–1. An inventory (1396) of the treasury of Hagia Sophia mentions a *ποδέα παλαιὰ τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας. ὁ ἅγιος Κωνσταντῖνος*: F. Miklosich–J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, II (Vienna, 1864), p. 596. Could this be a reference to Michael's *peplos*, used as a *podea* under an icon? For the *podea* see A. Frolov, 'La "Podea", un tissu décoratif de l'église byzantine', *B*, XIII (1938), 461–504; A. Grabar, 'La soie byzantine de l'évêque Gunther à la cathédrale de Bamberg', *Münchener Jahrbuch der bild. Kunst* (3rd series), VII (1956), 15–16.

54. According to Mr. Robert Van Nice of Dumbarton Oaks the metal bars between the porphyry columns in the northwest and southwest exedrae date from Justinian's building and could have been used for hanging textiles.

55. The epithet appears on/in: (1) a lead seal representing Michael holding an icon of the Virgin and Child above his head. The seal commemorates the restoration of the *sekretion*, the imperial tribunal, after the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261: see Zacos–Veglery, *Byzantine Lead Seals*, I, 3, pp. 1579–81 and plate 2756 *bis*. The date of this seal depends on the date of the reestablishment of the *sekretion* which is unknown: see I. Ševčenko, 'Léon Bardales et les juges généraux', *B*, XIX (1949), 257. (2) *Annales Ianuenses*, ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGH*, XVIII (Hanover, 1863), p. 243: *ab eo tempore citra idem imperator se appellavit in suis litteris et appellatus fuit aliis novus Constantinus*. This information appears under the year 1262 but from the context it is clear that *ab eo tempore* refers to the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261. See Dölger–Wirth, *Regesten*, N. 1906a. (3) a letter sent by Michael to Genoa early in 1262 contains the epithet in the emperor's title: L. Belgrano, 'Cinque documenti genovesi-orientali', *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria*, XVII (1885), 227. For the date see Dölger–Wirth, *Regesten*, N. 1914. (4) a Latin document of 1267 authorizing the Venetian legates to make a treaty with Michael: G. L. F. Tafel–G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, III (Vienna, 1857), p. 89. (5) treaty of 1268 with Venice:

source for the epithet is a letter which Michael sent to Genoa early in 1262; *novus Constantinus* appears in the emperor's title.⁵⁶ Indeed, the *Annales Ianuenses* state that Michael called himself the New Constantine in his letters from the time of his reconquest of Constantinople, and that others also used the epithet of him from that date.⁵⁷ Pachymeres gives some clue as to who the 'others' were. According to him, Germanos was said to have been the first person to call Michael the New Constantine.⁵⁸ This reputation, together with Germanos' gesture of hanging the *peplos* of Michael as the New Constantine in Hagia Sophia, indicates that Germanos did play a part in spreading the association of the epithet with Michael's name. In fact, Pachymeres says that the *peplos* showed Michael as the New Constantine 'to the Romans',⁵⁹ implying that the representation was intended to advertise the epithet in Constantinople. That the popularization of the epithet was associated with the patriarch was particularly significant for Michael since he had been without patriarchal support until the time of Germanos' patriarchate.⁶⁰

Pachymeres gives more evidence for relations between patriarch and emperor in the form of another representation, that of the three Germanoi – the three patriarchs by that name⁶¹

Tafel-Thomas, op. cit., p. 93; Dölger-Wirth, *Regesten*, N. 1960. (6) Coislin 200, a manuscript of the New Testament sent by Michael to Louis IX of France in 1269: see P. Lemerle, 'Saint Louis et Byzance', *Journal Asiatique*, CCLVII (1970), 18–19. (7) chrysobull of 1277 for Venice: F. Miklosich–J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata*, III, p. 84; Dölger-Wirth, *Regesten*, N. 2026. (8) a fresco portrait of Michael dated to 1281/2: H. and H. Buschhausen, *Die Marienkirche von Apollonia in Albanien* (Vienna, 1976), pp. 146–54.

56. See note 55 (3).

57. See note 55 (2).

58. Pachymeres, I, 300, 12–14. His statement does not contradict the evidence of the Latin sources if Germanos gave Michael the epithet before he became patriarch, that is from 1261. This is highly plausible given Germanos' support of Michael in Asia Minor in 1259: see note 50 above.

59. Pachymeres, II, pp. 614, 16–615, 1: *κατά τε τι κλεισμὸν τοῦ νέον ἐκείνου Κωνσταντῖνον φανῆναι Ῥωμαίοις*.

60. For Marcian and Heraclius as New Constantines see J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum . . . collectio*, VII, cols. 169, 172; I. Shahid, in *DOP*, XXVI (1972), 310 n. 65.

61. For Germanos I (715–30) and Germanos II (1223–40) see H. G. Beck,

– which was displayed in Hagia Sophia to the right of the Beautiful Gate.⁶² The representation (Pachymeres does not say whether it was a mosaic, textile or carved relief) was presumably commissioned by Michael in honour of Germanos III.⁶³ This work, as well as the *peplos* of Michael, testifies not only to the goodwill between emperor and patriarch but also perhaps to a show of mutual support and public image building.⁶⁴

Given this background of relations between the heads of Church and State, it is not surprising that Michael was amenable to the patriarch's suggestion that he appoint 'men of the Church' to teaching positions. The emperor's *megas logothetes*, George Akropolites, had been teaching in Constantinople from about 1261 and Germanos proposed that it was time to appoint others, 'not least of all men of the Church'. The patriarch put forward Manuel Holobolos' name for, according to Pachymeres, Germanos respected Holobolos' learning.⁶⁵

Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich (Munich, 1959), pp. 473–5; 667–8.

62. Pachymeres, II, p. 614, 9–12. The location of the Beautiful Gate is a much disputed problem. It could be either the main west door of the church or the south door of the vestibule. See the discussion by C. Mango, *Materials for the Study of the Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul* (Washington, D.C., 1962), p. 97; R. Cormack–E. J. W. Hawkins, *DOP*, XXXI (1977), 249 note. Pachymeres' reference does not give any indication as to which of the two doors the Beautiful Gate might be.

63. Pachymeres' description of the Michael *peplos* and the icon (?) of the three Germanoi shows that the interior of Hagia Sophia, in the late Byzantine period at least, was decorated with movable 'icons' and therefore differed considerably in appearance from the building of Justinian's time. Descriptions by later Russian travellers confirm that these movable decorations were numerous. See G. P. Majeska in *DOP*, XXVII (1973), 71–87, esp. 87. The marble revetment on the ground floor and in the galleries is marked by dowel holes which were probably made for the hanging of icons. I am indebted to Mr. Van Nice for this information. See also Majeska, op. cit., p. 78.

64. Germanos' public image suffered because (1) his translation to the patriarchal throne from a metropolitan see was considered uncanonical (2) his former see, Adrianople, was low (fortieth) in the list of metropolitan sees. See Pachymeres, I, p. 282, 2–4; pp. 290, 13–291, 4; H. Gelzer, 'Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der *Notitiae episcopatum*, ein Beitrag zur byzantinischen Kirchen- und Verwaltungsgeschichte', *Abhandlungen der Philosophisch-Philologischen Klasse der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, XXI (Munich, 1901), p. 597; see also note 47 above.

65. Pachymeres, I, pp. 282, 18–283, 16.

Furthermore, Holobolos had taken monastic vows four years earlier at the time of his punishment by the emperor and so he could satisfy Germanos' wish to draw on the Church's ranks for teachers. The emperor agreed to Holobolos' appointment and Germanos conferred the title of rhetor (ῥήτωρ) on him.⁶⁶ Holobolos returned to public life with this appointment which must be dated to 1265–6 because Germanos was patriarch only for that year.⁶⁷

The episode related by Pachymeres constitutes one of the very few sources for the reestablishment of educational facilities in the capital after 1261. But it is not without problems of interpretation, for instance with regard to Holobolos' place of instruction.⁶⁸ However, one point does emerge clearly from the passage: there were no men of the ecclesiastical hierarchy teaching in Constantinople in a high official position in 1265. The patriarch Germanos, in trying to rectify the situation, was restoring to the patriarchate a prerogative which it possessed but appears not to have claimed or exercised since 1261.⁶⁹ In

66. Ibid., I, p. 284, 10–15; Laurent, *Les Regestes*, N. 1380; F. Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1926), p. 57. It should be noted that it was the patriarch who confirmed (προσεπισφραγίσας) Holobolos in the title of rhetor and not the emperor, as J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ de l'église byzantine* (Paris, 1970), p. 110, note 4, seems to think. It is not however clear whether the emperor's approval was necessary because Holobolos had been in disgrace or because the emperor usually had a say in these appointments.

67. The appointment is likely to have been made early in Germanos' patriarchate. See Laurent, *Les Regestes*, N. 1376.

68. It is generally thought that Holobolos was appointed to teach at the school of the *orphanotropheion*, attached to the church of Sts. Peter and Paul. See, e.g. R. Browning, 'The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century', *B*, XXXII (1962), 176–7; J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ*, pp. 110–11 and note 4 (p. 110). However, this opinion is based on an interpretation of Pachymeres (I, p. 284) which does not appear to me to be warranted. I hope to discuss the problem of education in Constantinople after 1261 elsewhere.

69. By this I do not mean to suggest that we are dealing with a patriarchal institution, a 'Patriarchal School' but simply with the patriarch's right to have men of the ecclesiastical hierarchy giving instruction. See the comments of Darrouzès, *op. cit.*, p. 111, note 2. For the patriarch's role in education in the empire of Nicaea see A. Moffatt, 'Education. A cohesive force for Byzantium 1204–1261?', in the *Acts of the Fifteenth International Congress for Byzantine Studies* (forthcoming).

turn, the emperor, by agreeing to the appointment, was furthering his programme of restitution in the capital.

Furthermore, the Pachymeres passage supplies evidence for yet another patriarchal revival: the title of rhetor. This title is found in the ecclesiastical lists of office for the twelfth century and later; its holder possesses a rank in the Church hierarchy.⁷⁰ It would appear that Holobolos was the first holder of the title in Constantinople since 1261, if not since the fall of the city to the Latins in 1204.⁷¹ But it is not the title alone which was revived in 1265; the functions attached to the title from the twelfth century seem likewise to have been restored. Ecclesiastical lists and *lemmata* to orations from the period before the Latin conquest show that the rhetor taught.⁷² But, in addition, as his title implies, he was responsible for writing and delivering orations.⁷³ This latter function is also ascribed to the rhetor in a late thirteenth century ecclesiastical list.⁷⁴

Holobolos, then, provides the link between twelfth-century practices and those of the thirteenth-century restored capital, for it is as a rhetor⁷⁵ that he proclaimed the three orations

70. See Darrouzès, *op. cit.*, p. 101; p. 547; pp. 200–1.

71. Although some titles, such as *hypatos ton philosophon* and perhaps *maistor ton philosophon* are attested for the empire of Nicaea, there is no evidence for a rhetor. See Blemmydes, *Curriculum Vitae*, ed. Heisenberg, p. 13, 1; Browning, *B*, XXXII (1962), 199–200.

72. See Escorial Y-II-10, f. 221v: *ὅτε οἱ τοῦ ῥήτορος μαθηταί* . . . : E. Miller, *Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs de la Bibliothèque de l'Escorial* (Paris, 1848), p. 208; also Browning, 'An Anonymous *ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ* addressed to Alexios I Comnenus', *B*, XXVIII (1958), 33; *B*, XXXIII (1963), 29 note.

73. See Miller, *op. cit.*, pp. 208–9; Browning, 'An unpublished address of Nicephorus Chrysoberges to Patriarch John X Kamateros of 1202', *Byzantine Studies/Etudes Byzantines*, V (1978), 64 note 1.

74. Darrouzès, *op. cit.*, pp. 547, 549.

75. Whereas Pachymeres always calls Holobolos 'the rhetor' or 'the rhetor of the Church' (I, p. 374; 392; 394; II, pp. 25, 90), the *lemmata* to Holobolos' orations refer to him as *ὁ ῥήτωρ τῶν ῥητόρων* (ed. Treu, pp. 51, 78); see also the *lemmata* to his poems: ed. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, V (Paris, 1833), pp. 159, 167. I have not seen this title attributed to anyone else. Late thirteenth and fourteenth century ecclesiastical lists of office simply mention the title of rhetor: Darrouzès, *op. cit.*, pp. 549, 554, 568, 571. It could be a variation on the title of *maistor ton rhetoron*, attested in the twelfth century: see Darrouzès, *op. cit.*, p. 101; Browning, *B*, XXXIII (1962), 175–6; 178; 191–2; *B*, XXXIII (1963), pp. 39–40. For, according to Darrouzès (*op. cit.*, pp. 78–9), the *maistor ton rhetoron* was an imperial nominee although an ecclesiastical *archon*. This may also have been true of Holobolos: see note 66 above.

addressed to the emperor Michael. Although the emperor actually made Holobolos' appointment possible, as a rhetor Holobolos held a position within the Church.⁷⁶ Thus, it is within the framework of the Church's patronage that we should place the orations addressed to Michael. They belong to the restoration of an aspect of the patriarchate's traditional role.

Interest in, and emphasis on tradition is apparent in the orations themselves. Holobolos makes a point of mentioning practices which have become obsolete and others which have survived and are in use. He can therefore tell us about customs and ceremonial practices not known from other sources. For instance, when he talks about the birth of the emperor Michael's son Constantine in the Porphyra⁷⁷ he describes the practice of hanging up a purple sandal⁷⁸ in a prominent place, an action which signifies the birth of a son. This was an old custom which survived.

The interests of an antiquarian are evident elsewhere as well. Holobolos describes the by then obsolete custom of presenting to the emperor once a year a *peplos*, a woven garment on which there were scenes depicting the ruler's achievements for that year.⁷⁹ The gift of a *peplos* was part of an annual ceremony at which the ruler was presented with tribute.⁸⁰ Holobolos claims to know about the custom and the actual scenes represented on the garments from 'writers', specifically 'those who recommend goodwill in ruling subjects'.⁸¹ This phrase suggests that the writers are authors of treatises on kingship or the 'Mirror of Princes',⁸² as the genre is known. Notable authors of such

76. See Darrouzès, *op. cit.*, p. 111 and notes.

77. For the Porphyra or purple chamber of the palace see Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, ed. and trans. B. Leib, II (Paris, 1945), pp. 60, 27–61, 2. For Constantine *porphyrogennetos*, Michael's third son, see Pachymeres, I, p. 183, 16–17; Polemis, *The Doukai*, p. 160. Holobolos' explanation of this custom gives the impression that he is addressing people for whom it is a novelty.

78. Ed. Treu, p. 91, 3–11.

79. *Ibid.*, p. 31, 2–14.

80. *Ibid.*, p. 30, 6–13.

81. *Ibid.*, p. 31, 4–5: *χρεὼν γὰρ πιστεύειν τοῖς συγγραφεῦσι καὶ μᾶλλον οἷς πρὸς τὸ ἀρχεῖν ὑπηκόων ὑπαγορεύουσιν εὐνοίαν.*

82. For the 'Fürstenspiegel' see now H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, pp. 157ff.

treatises are the deacon Agapetos,⁸³ Theophylaktos of Ochrid,⁸⁴ and Nikephoros Blemmydes.⁸⁵ Indeed, two of these writers begin their work by mentioning the practice of presenting gifts to the emperor once a year, each person according to his own means. These writers claim that their *logoi* are gifts which fulfil this function.⁸⁶ But it is possible to trace the practice even further back in time to the pre-Christian period. The orator Isocrates in a work *Ad Nicoclem* refers to 'those who are accustomed to give to you, O kings, vestments or bronze or gold which has been worked.'⁸⁷ None of these writers, however, describes the *peplos* with its scenes representing the ruler's achievements. One might suspect that Holobolos' passage is merely a literary borrowing if it were not for the specific way in which he describes the appearance of the *peploi* and his source for this.⁸⁸ He may have in mind sources which are not extant.

83. For the text of Agapetos' *Ekthesis*, addressed to Justinian I (527–65) see *MPG*, LXXXVI, cols. 1163–86. On this work see the study by I. Ševčenko, 'Agapetus East and West: The Fate of a Byzantine "Mirror of Princes"', *Revue des études sud-est Européennes*, XVI (1978), 3–44, with a comprehensive bibliography and a discussion of other works in this genre. See also P. Henry, 'A Mirror for Justinian: The *Ekthesis* of Agapetus Diaconus', *GRBS*, VIII (1967), 281–308.

84. *Παίδεια βασιλική*, addressed to Constantine Doukas in c. 1088/9: *MPG*, CXXVI, cols. 253–85. See B. Leib, 'La *παίδεια βασιλική* de Théophylacte, archevêque de Bulgarie, et sa contribution à l'histoire de la fin du XI^e siècle', *REB*, XI (1953), 197–204.

85. *βασιλικὸς ἀνδριάς*, written for Theodore II Laskaris (1254–1258): K. Emminger, ed., *Studien zu den griechischen Fürstenspiegeln*, Programm des königlichen Maximilians-Gymnasiums für das Schuljahr 1905/1906 (Munich, 1906), pp. 8–36. For a fourteenth-century paraphrase of the work see *MPG*, CXLII, cols. 657–74. See also I. Ševčenko, 'A new manuscript of Nicephorus Blemmydes' "Imperial Statue", and of some Patriarchal Letters', *Byzantine Studies/Etudes Byzantines*, V (1978), 222–8.

86. Theophylaktos, *MPG*, CXXVI, col. 253; Blemmydes, ed. Emminger, p. 8.

87. G. Benseler–F. Blass, *Isocratis orationes*, I (Leipzig, 1907), p. 13.

88. According to Holobolos, the scenes one might find represented on such *peploi* were: the emperor as founder of cities, victorious general, courageous hunter, dispenser of justice (ed. Treu, p. 31, 4–14). These themes constitute the activities of an ideal emperor and it is therefore interesting that Holobolos claims to have his information from treatises on kingship which advised rulers on how to be an ideal emperor. From descriptions of works of art it is known that the themes of the emperor as founder of cities, victorious general and

Unfortunately it is not possible to determine how long the custom had been obsolete.

Although the practice of giving a *peplos* to the ruler was out of date by Holobolos' time of writing, that of presenting a *logos* to the emperor once a year was not. Holobolos says of this 'ancient custom' that 'many years have passed and it survives, renewed, until the present'.⁸⁹ Allusions to the practice can be found not only in treatises on kingship where the *logos* is called a gift, as mentioned above, but also in orations. Themistius, in an address to the emperor Valentinian, refers to his orations as gifts he presents to the emperor, while other subjects provide less lasting offerings.⁹⁰ Another example, more recent in time to Holobolos, is that of Theodore II Laskaris' encomium for his father, the emperor John III Batatzes (1222–1254). Theodore calls his encomium 'verbal tribute', admitting that it is not usual for emperors to receive tribute from their sons.⁹¹

Holobolos places his orations within this tradition for he describes them as 'verbal tribute' (*λογικός φόρος*) and 'annual tribute' (*ἐπέτειος φόρος*).⁹² Perhaps his awareness of and emphasis on traditional practices, evident not only in these orations but also in other works,⁹³ indicates that he is renewing customs which had not been practised in Constantinople since the recovery of the city or, in some cases, in the empire of Nicaea. Before the Latin conquest of Constantinople it was usual for the rhetor to deliver an annual *basilikos logos* on

hunter of wild beasts were well-represented. Among the few surviving works of this kind are some silk fragments which depict an emperor hunting, and a victorious general receiving crowns from two cities. See A. Grabar, *L'Empereur dans l'art byzantin* (Paris, 1936), pp. 59–61; idem, 'La soie byzantine de l'évêque Gunther à la cathédrale de Bamberg', *Münchner Jahrbuch der bild. Kunst*, VII (1956), 7–26.

89. Ed. Treu, p. 30, 6–9.

90. G. Downey, ed., *Themistii Orationes*, I (Leipzig, 1965), pp. 196, 218.

91. Par. gr. 3048, f. 11v: 'Ἀλλ' ἰδοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν νύκτων φόρος λογικός. On this manuscript see C. Astruc, 'La tradition manuscrite des oeuvres oratoires profanes de Théodore II Laskaris', *Travaux et Mémoires*, I (1965), 393–404.

92. Ed. Treu, p. 52, 18; p. 78, 5–6.

93. See Holobolos' *Ἐρμηνεία* for the emperor: ed. Treu, *Manuelis Holoboli orationes*, p. 20, 8ff.: 'Ἔθος ἔκειτο πάλαι; also see his Epiphany poem, ed. Treu in *BZ*, V (1896), 546: *Πρὸς ὁδὼρ λέγειν ῥήτορας ἔκειτο πάλαι νόμος*.

Epiphany (6 January).⁹⁴ However, Holobolos' orations do not appear to be Epiphany orations; they do not contain the light and water imagery common to such works.⁹⁵ If the *lemma* to Holobolos' second oration is to be believed, the oration was delivered on Christmas day. However, the other two orations give no indication of the specific day of delivery. It is interesting to note in this connection that a late thirteenth-century list of ecclesiastical offices states that the rhetor's function is to write a *basilikos logos* once a year; it does not, however, specify a particular day of the year.⁹⁶ It may be that after the recovery of Constantinople the annual imperial oration was no longer attached to a particular feast day of the church.

Holobolos' annual orations, like the *peploi* which used to be presented to rulers, are a record of the emperor's activities for the year. The orations relate Michael's *πράξεις* for 1259–61. The first oration alludes to the battle of Pelagonia (1259 summer), the siege at Galata (1260 winter–spring) and the treaty of Nymphaion (1261 spring); the second describes the taking of Constantinople (25 July 1261) and Michael's entry into the city (15 August 1261); the third, Michael's building activities in Constantinople, his third proclamation as emperor; his efforts with respect to the reestablishment of educational facilities. The orations contain information not always known from other sources. In some cases they confirm or modify other contemporary accounts. They therefore constitute important sources for the early years of Michael's reign. What follows is a brief discussion of various points of interest raised by the orations.

94. See the *lemmata* to a collection of twelfth-century orations in Escorial Y-II–10: E. Miller, *Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs de la Bibliothèque de l'Escorial*, pp. 208–9; J. Darrouzès, 'Notes sur Euthyme Tornikès, Euthyme Malakès et Georges Tornikès', *REB*, XXIII (1965), 164–5.

95. E.g., see the imagery in Holobolos' poems for Epiphany: ed. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, V, pp. 164–7; 170–5; 176–8; also Browning, *B*, XXVIII (1958), 36–40.

96. For the list see Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ*, p. 549. Darrouzès (p. 207) does not however believe that the practice of an annual imperial oration was maintained. Compare the rhetor's function in the late thirteenth century notice with those mentioned in later lists: Darrouzès, *op. cit.*, pp. 554, 23; 568, 21; 571, 18.

Michael's flight to the Turks (1256): In accordance with the rules of the *basilikos logos* Holobolos gives background biographical information on Michael in his first oration.⁹⁷ He alludes briefly to Michael's flight to the Turks which he calls an 'escape' from the fire lit by *φθόνος*, or ill-will.⁹⁸ The allusion is to Theodore II Laskaris who was emperor at the time and whose ill-will Michael feared, according to Akropolites and Pachymeres.⁹⁹ It is of interest to note that Holobolos' oration is the earliest extant source to describe this episode in Michael's life¹⁰⁰ and it does so in terms which Michael himself later employs in the autobiographical sections of his *typika* for the monasteries of the Archangel Michael and St. Demetrios.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, Holobolos uses this rather dubious incident in Michael's career to point out Michael's imperial qualities: 'you were emperor and autokrator before (you wore) the chlamys . . . and you were a ruler by everyone's choice before you put on the diadem and purple sandals'.¹⁰² His treatment of the incident is reminiscent of the way George Akropolites handles the same in his *History*. Akropolites uses the opportunity to remark that the sultan and his followers could see that Michael was worthy of sovereignty merely by looking at him.¹⁰³ This passage in Holobolos' oration

97. Ed. Treu, p. 32, 16ff. See T. C. Burgess, 'Epideictic Literature', *The University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology*, III (1902), 113–43; Menander Rhetor, *Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, ed. L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, III (Leipzig, 1856), pp. 368ff.

98. Ed. Treu, p. 34, 23ff.

99. Akropolites, ed. Heisenberg, pp. 134–5; Pachymeres, I, pp. 24–6. For this incident see Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael*, pp. 26ff.

100. See also the letter (1256) of Niketas Karantenos to the abbot of St. John's, Patmos, for a passing reference to Michael's flight: *ἔφυγε καὶ ἐπῆγεν εἰς τὸ σурτάνον*: M. Nystazopoulou in *Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὁρλάνδον*, II (1966), 288–9.

101. See A. Dmitrievski, *Opisanie Liturgicheskikh Rukopisei*, I (Kiev, 1895), p. 790. The date of this *typikon* has not been ascertained: see Dölger–Wirth, *Regesten*, N. 2065. See also H. Grégoire, 'de vita sua', *B*, XXIX–XXX (1959–60), 451–453, written shortly before his death in 1282; and Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur*, p. 167 note 10. George of Cyprus (Patriarch Gregory: 1283–9), in an oration to Michael written in the early 1270s, likewise refers to the cause of Michael's flight as *φθόνος*. See MPG, CXLII, col. 364; see below, note 147 for the date of the oration.

102. Ed. Treu, pp. 34–5.

103. Ed. Heisenberg, pp. 136–7, esp. pp. 136, 26–137, 1.

perhaps reflects the kinds of legends which were being propagated about Michael during his lifetime.¹⁰⁴

The siege of Galata (1260): Holobolos describes an attempt on Constantinople which Michael made in the winter-spring of 1260.¹⁰⁵ This incident should be identified with the siege of Galata known from Akropolites and Pachymeres. These sources differ considerably as to how serious the attempt on the city was. Akropolites claims that the emperor took only a small army with him and that the success of the operation depended on the services of a Latin, Ansel.¹⁰⁶ Pachymeres describes a serious full-scale campaign, with no reference to the Latin.¹⁰⁷ These discrepancies are difficult to reconcile and have given the impression that the sources are referring to two different operations.¹⁰⁸ Holobolos' testimony, although embedded in a rhetorical context, is an aid in this matter. He says that the attempt lasted several months – from winter until spring – and he describes the various methods used – attacks by land and sea, promises of gifts, etc.¹⁰⁹ His story, then, is in keeping with Pachymeres' account of a serious campaign¹¹⁰ and implies that Akropolites is describing only one part of the attempt (that dependent on the promises of Ansel), in an effort to play down Michael's investment in a failed venture.

The treaty of Nymphaion (1261): Holobolos is the only Greek source to refer to Genoese contact with Michael which led to the

104. Another story, about Michael's infancy, is related by Pachymeres, I, p. 128, 5–15.

105. Ed. Treu, pp. 43–4.

106. Ed. Heisenberg, pp. 173–5.

107. Pachymeres, I, pp. 110–11; 119; 122–4; see also Gregoras, I, pp. 80–1.

108. See Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael*, pp. 76ff., who does not take Holobolos' story into account.

109. Ed. Treu, p. 43, 20–2 (departure from Asia Minor in late autumn); p. 44, 28–30 (return in spring); p. 44, 16–21 (methods used).

110. See also Theodore Skoutariotes' account, a paraphrase of Akropolites' *History* which does, however, at times depart from the text. In relating the Galata siege Skoutariotes also gives the impression of a serious attempt, thereby differing considerably from Akropolites' version. See K. N. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, VIII (Paris, 1894), pp. 546–7.

Genoese-Greek alliance against Venice, formed shortly before Michael regained Constantinople.¹¹¹ He mentions that Genoese envoys sought out the emperor Michael – information which is in agreement with western sources – but he does not allude to the alliance as such. Instead he gives *ekphraseis* of the two *peploi* which were sent to Genoa at the time.¹¹² One of these still exists in Genoa (Palazzo Bianco).¹¹³ It is therefore possible to compare it with Holobolos' description. According to Holobolos, the *peplos* was decorated with scenes from the life and martyrdom of St. Lawrence (patron saint of Genoa), depicted in gold thread.¹¹⁴ Holobolos lists the various forms of torture which Lawrence suffered in his martyrdom and which were represented on the *peplos*.¹¹⁵ In addition, there were scenes from the lives of other saints to whom Holobolos alludes.¹¹⁶ Each scene was accompanied by an inscription in Latin letters.¹¹⁷

111. Ed. Treu, pp. 45–7; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael*, pp. 81ff., esp. p. 85.

112. Holobolos describes only two but the text of the treaty states that three cloths will be sent to Genoa, two to the commune and one for the archbishop. See C. Manfroni, 'Le Relazioni fra Genova, l'Impero Bizantino e i Turchi', *Atti della Società ligure di Storia Patria*, XXVIII (1896), esp. 795; Dölger-Wirth, *Regesten*, N. 1890. See also F. Michel, *Recherches sur le commerce, la fabrication et l'usage des étoffes de soie, d'or et d'argent et autres tissus précieux*, I (Paris, 1852), pp. 63–5.

113. See X. Siderides in *EEBS*, III (1926), 173, 187, for the *peplos*, including a drawing; R. S. Lopez, 'The Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire', *Speculum*, XX (1945), plate VII; P. Johnstone, *The Byzantine Tradition in Church Embroidery* (London, 1967), p. 76.

114. For the view that gold-figured embroidery did not become common until the late thirteenth century when it was introduced as an economy measure, see Johnstone, *op. cit.*, pp. 7–11.

115. Ed. Treu, p. 47, 12–21.

116. Holobolos does not refer to them by name but their identity is known from the inscriptions: Sts. Xystos (pope Sixtus II) and Hippolytos, both contemporaries of Lawrence and associated with his life and martyrdom. See Siderides, *EEBS*, III (1926), 171–3, for a discussion of these figures.

117. See Siderides, *EEBS*, V (1928), 376–8, for the inscriptions. P. Johnstone (*op. cit.*, p. 76) has suggested that the technique used for embroidering the inscription points to Latin workmanship and therefore that the *peplos* was made in Constantinople where Michael found Latin workmen when he arrived. The silk of the *peplos* may have been from Nicaea, which was known for its silk taffeta (cendal). On this see G. Bratianu, *Recherches sur le commerce génois dans la mer noire au XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1929), pp. 110–11; W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au Moyen-Age*, II (Leipzig, 1936), p. 701.

Holobolos' *ekphrasis* is accurate in what it says but it fails to mention one interesting and central scene – that of the emperor Michael being escorted into the church of St. Lawrence in Genoa by St. Lawrence, with the Archangel Michael standing between them.¹¹⁸ This scene is fifth in the upper register of ten scenes. Its ideological statement is clear and its iconography is similar to that on another cloth sent by Michael to Pope Gregory X at the time of the Council of Lyons (1274). The textile depicted Pope Gregory leading Michael to St. Peter – a visual statement of the fruits of the Council.¹¹⁹ The scenes in these textile gifts were chosen with a view to pleasing the Latins.¹²⁰ Holobolos' omission of the central scene in the St. Lawrence *peplos* is not surprising if one considers the position in which the emperor is represented.

Holobolos prefaces his description of the other *peplos* sent to Genoa by claiming that the Genoese envoys specially requested an image of the emperor as 'a means of protection', 'an averter of evil'.¹²¹ The cloth which Michael gave them depicted the emperor 'not in gold or any other costly material but in colours which beautify'.¹²² If the oration in which Holobolos describes the *peploi* was delivered in 1265,¹²³ his portrayal of the Genoese as eager to have an image of Michael in their city comes at a time when Genoese-Greek relations were not good. In 1264 Michael

118. The inscription reads *Sanctus Laurentius inducens Altissimum Imperatorem Gregorum Dominum Michaelem Ducam Angelum Comnenum Paleologum in ecclesiam Januensiam*: Siderides, *EEBS*, V (1928), 377. For the Archangel Michael see Siderides, *EEBS*, III (1926), 187 (plate). See Pachymeres, II, p. 234, 16–22, for the bronze statue of the Archangel which the emperor erected in Constantinople after 1261.

119. See Johnstone, *op. cit.*, pp. 76–7.

120. *Ibid.*, p. 76.

121. Ed. Treu, p. 46, 27–34.

122. Ed. Treu, p. 47, 7–12. See M. Théocharis, *Ἡ βυζαντινὴ εἰκὼν τοῦ ἐν Τεργέστη καθεδρικοῦ ναοῦ, Πρακτικά τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν*, XXXVII (1962), 254–60, who interprets the passage to mean that the emperor's image was not embroidered but painted on cloth. She attributes a surviving example of tempera on silk, a depiction of St. Justus in Trieste, to Byzantine workmanship.

123. Since the oration in question is the first of the three, there is a good chance it was delivered in 1265. See note 137 below.

had discovered a Genoese conspiracy to betray Constantinople into Latin hands.¹²⁴

Holobolos' *ekphraseis* of the *peploi* are useful contributions to our knowledge of textiles with figural decoration in this period. *Peploi* seem to have been popular decorations for churches, either as altar cloths, tomb covers, or hangings.¹²⁵ However, apart from the Genoa *peplos* of St. Lawrence, there are no extant textiles from the thirteenth century with representations of emperors.¹²⁶ Therefore, Holobolos' mention of the *peplos* portraying Michael, together with Pachymeres' reference to the Hagia Sophia *peplos* of Michael as the New Constantine, are valuable accounts of otherwise unknown artefacts.

The entry into Constantinople (15 August 1261): Holobolos, who was present at Michael's ceremonial entry into Constantinople,¹²⁷ gives a full account. His version of the event is in agreement with the accounts of Akropolites and Pachymeres but on some points he has more to say.¹²⁸ This is particularly true with regard to the prayers of thanksgiving which Michael VIII commissioned Akropolites to write. Akropolites tells us that he wrote thirteen prayers, each of which had its own theme.¹²⁹ But Holobolos actually lists the subject of each prayer which was read out by the Metropolitan of Cyzicus at the Golden Gate.¹³⁰ The list reads like the litanies in the liturgy on behalf of the city and its inhabitants.¹³¹ Holobolos in fact calls the prayers *τὰ τῇ πόλει σωτήρια*.¹³² He is, therefore, in this case, useful in

124. Pachymeres, I, p. 167f; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael*, pp. 169ff.

125. See M. Théocharis, 'Sur une broderie du musée de Prague', *BS*, XXIV (1963), 106–10; *ibid.*, 'Ἡ ἐνδυτὴ τοῦ Ἀγίου Μάρκου', *EEBS*, XXIX (1959), 193–202; A. Frolov, 'La 'Podea', un tissu décoratif de l'église byzantine', *B*, XIII (1938), 461–504; A. Grabar, *Münchner Jahrbuch der bild. Kunst*, VII (1956), 15–16 and fig. 15.

126. For earlier extant textiles representing (anonymous) emperors see A. Grabar, *L'Empereur dans l'art byzantin*, pp. 59–61; *ibid.*, *Münchner Jahrbuch der bild. Kunst*, VII (1956), 7–26.

127. Ed. Treu, p. 74, 7ff.

128. See above, note 2.

129. Ed. Heisenberg, p. 186, 19–28.

130. Ed. Treu, pp. 73, 24–74, 2.

131. See F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford, 1896), p. 335, 25ff., pp. 362–3.

132. Ed. Treu, p. 73, 30–1.

reconstructing a literary work which appears not to have survived. Furthermore, by describing the nature of the prayers, he gives us a better understanding of the character of the ceremonial entry.

Andronikos' proclamation as emperor (1261?): Using Holobolos' orations, Dölger argued that Michael's son Andronikos¹³³ was proclaimed emperor at the time of Michael's third proclamation as emperor in Constantinople (1261) and not as late as 1272, as had been thought.¹³⁴ Dölger based this idea on references in the orations (which he dated to 1261) to Andronikos as *basileus*.

Apart from Holobolos' orations, the only other source to give an indication of the date of Andronikos' title of emperor is Pachymeres. The latter calls Andronikos *basileus* when referring to him shortly before his coronation in 1272.¹³⁵ However, to determine just how long before 1272 Andronikos held the title we must rely on Holobolos. He refers to Andronikos as *basileus* in all three orations.¹³⁶ Therefore, Andronikos must have been proclaimed emperor by the time the first oration was delivered. Given my argument for the date of the orations, Andronikos' proclamation would have taken place by 1265/6.¹³⁷

133. Andronikos, Michael's second son, named after his paternal grandfather, was not yet three years old in August 1261. Michael's first son Manuel died before the entry into Constantinople. See Pachymeres, I, p. 183, 12-15; pp. 159, 17-160, 1; Polemis, *The Doukai*, p. 158.

134. Dölger, *Festschrift Eichmann* (1940) (= *ΠΑΡΑΣΠΟΡΑ*, 1961), pp. 179-90, esp. 187-9. This view has been accepted by Wirth in his reedition of Dölger's *Regesten*, pp. 60, 145; also, Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (1968), p. 450, note 1.

135. Pachymeres, I, p. 318, 12-13.

136. Ed. Treu, p. 50, 8ff; p. 77, 20ff; p. 93, 30ff.

137. The orations could have been delivered any time from 1265 (the date of Holobolos' appointment as rhetor) to 1273, when Holobolos fell into disgrace again and went into a monastic exile from which he probably did not return until after Michael's death (1282). See Pachymeres, I, pp. 392-4; II, p. 25; Janin, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (Paris, 1975), p. 198; Previale, *BZ*, XLII (1943-9), 8; Kourouses, *Ἀθηνᾶ*, LXXV (1974-5), 355. Pachymeres refers to Holobolos as rhetor throughout (I, p. 374; p. 392) and so, theoretically, he could have delivered the orations any time during that period. However, a date closer to his appointment as rhetor by Germanos, i.e. a date in the mid- to late 1260s, would seem more plausible than a later date.

However, the redating of the orations does not necessarily invalidate Dölger's argument because the orations contain two passages which implicate Andronikos in the proclamation ceremony known to have taken place before Christmas 1261. In describing the scene of Michael's proclamation Holobolos states, 'my young emperor was present there with his parents, the emperors, sharing in the proclamation'.¹³⁸ Elsewhere, Michael and his wife are said to have had Andronikos as a 'partner' in the coronation.¹³⁹

Do these passages imply that Andronikos was proclaimed emperor in 1261 with his father? Pachymeres makes no reference to a proclamation. He describes only Michael's coronation in Hagia Sophia.¹⁴⁰ Furthermore, it is difficult to explain how Andronikos' proclamation could have taken place before Arsenios' eyes.¹⁴¹ Besides, Akropolites tells us that most people, especially the officials, were not in favour of the co-proclamation of Andronikos.¹⁴² In the light of these negative indications, it is difficult to interpret the Holobolos passages literally. Andronikos' proclamation most likely took place after John Laskaris' blinding (December 1261) and by 1265–6.

The triumph for Alexios Strategopoulos (1261): Holobolos mentions a triumph (θρίαμβος) which took place in Constantinople immediately after Michael's coronation in Hagia Sophia.¹⁴³ He describes the crowd which assembled – the senate and the people, artisans and tradesmen – and the musical instruments – cymbals, trumpets, horns, and pipes – which were used to play

Certain elements in the first oration especially (see page 28) give the impression that the orations were begun under Germanos, even if the last oration was delivered after he had vacated the patriarchal throne.

138. Ed. Treu, p. 93, 30–1: *παρὴν ἐκεῖ τῆς ἀναγορεύσεως τοῖς τεκοῦσι καὶ βασιλεῦσι συναπολαύων καὶ ὁ νέος ἐμὸς βασιλεὺς.*

139. Ed. Treu, p. 77, 21–2: *κοινωνὸν ἔχοντες τούτου καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν δεσπότην καὶ βασιλέα.*

140. Pachymeres, I, pp. 190, 16–191, 13; p. 173, 15–18.

141. See the comments of Failler (in his review of Dölger–Wirth, *Regesten*), *REB*, XXXVII (1979), 273.

142. Ed. Heisenberg, p. 188, 19–189, 6. This passage refers to an occasion after the entry into Constantinople and after the patriarch Arsenios' arrival in the capital.

143. Ed. Treu, p. 94, 14–27.

the song of victory. Holobolos' description probably refers to the triumph which Michael gave to honour his Caesar, Alexios Strategopoulos, commander of the troops which took Constantinople in July 1261.¹⁴⁴ Gregoras, the only other source for the triumph, claims that it was one of Michael's immediate concerns upon entering Constantinople.¹⁴⁵

The orations, then, constitute a useful source for various aspects of the years 1259–61. But if they were delivered in 1265–1266–1267 at the earliest, as argued above,¹⁴⁶ why do they celebrate the emperor's activities in the first three years of his reign and not more recent events? Perhaps the most obvious reason is that Michael's restoration of Constantinople after fifty-seven years of Latin occupation was the crowning achievement of his career and, therefore, appropriate material at any date. The theme is found in works later than Holobolos' three orations. George of Cyprus (later the Patriarch Gregory: 1283–9), in an encomium to the emperor Michael which has been dated to the early 1270s,¹⁴⁷ gives an entire catalogue of the emperor's activities from his early life, before he became emperor, to the rebuilding of Constantinople. An anonymous oration which could not have been written before 1272 and is attributed to Holobolos by its editor, likewise recounts the events of Michael's early reign.¹⁴⁸ Again, as late as 1281, after his

144. For Strategopoulos see Akropolites, ed. Heisenberg, p. 182, 4ff.; Zacos–Veglery, *Byzantine Lead Seals*, pp. 1577–9. The lack of reference to the Caesar in this passage in the oration may be a reflection of Strategopoulos' subsequent failure in a campaign in Epiros. See Gregoras, I, p. 90, 9ff.; Pachymeres, I, 89, 4ff.

145. Gregoras, I, pp. 88, 12–89, 13. Pachymeres, I, pp. 173, 18–174, 2, only mentions the addition of Strategopoulos' name to the diptychs, a measure introduced after Michael's coronation, it seems. See also Gregoras, I, p. 89, 10–13, for the inclusion of Strategopoulos' name in 'songs of praise' everywhere in the empire for the duration of one year.

146. See p. 19 and note 137.

147. J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, I (Paris, 1829), pp. 313–58; *MPG*, CXLII, cols. 345–85. The oration has been dated to 1270–2 by J. Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos* (Paris, 1959), p. 35 and note 3.

148. See L. Previale, 'Un panegirico inedito per Michele VIII Paleologo', *BZ*, XLII (1943–9), 1–14 (attribution); 15–45 (text). The oration cannot have been delivered before 1272 because it refers to Andronikos, Michael's son, as νεώστεπτος (p. 45, 3): see Previale, *op. cit.*, p. 8; Dölger, *Festschrift Eichmann* (1940), pp. 184–5.

military success at Berat, Michael ordered frescoes to be painted on the palace walls depicting his latest deeds but also those from the beginning of his reign.¹⁴⁹

Therefore, if Michael's activities in 1259–61 provided themes for literature and art until the end of his reign, it is not surprising to find Holobolos using the material in 1265 or later. But there is another possible reason for Holobolos' choice of subject matter. He was most probably the first rhetor of the Church to deliver orations in honour of the emperor since the events described in the orations took place. The subject was new from this point of view. To be sure, court officials must have celebrated the emperor's achievements before this. Indeed, George Akropolites, Michael's *megas logothetes*, mentions an oration he wrote for the emperor soon after his entry into Constantinople.¹⁵⁰ Holobolos himself as a *grammatikos* may have composed encomia for Michael. In the third of his orations he refers to his earlier adolescent attempts at writing such pieces.¹⁵¹ But orations by lay officials could not take the place of those traditionally written and delivered by rhetors of the Church. The rhetor's orations were an ecclesiastical institution, a means by which the Church honoured the emperor. It was not until the patriarchate of Germanos that relations between emperor and patriarch were conducive to the revival of ecclesiastical institutions. It was probably therefore not until Germanos' patriarchate that a rhetor of the Church celebrated the emperor's *πράξεις*.

In Germanos Michael had a patriarch interested in reviving neglected customs.¹⁵² The patriarch took the initiative in reinstating the position of rhetor and its attendant functions.¹⁵³

149. Pachymeres, I, p. 517, 2–6; C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312–1453, Sources and Documents* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1972), p. 246.

150. Ed. Heisenberg, p. 188, 20–8.

151. Ed. Treu, p. 79, 16–28. Holobolos' comment here is further evidence that the orations could not have been delivered in 1261 for if he was a *παιδίον* in 1261 (Pachymeres, I, p. 192, 20–1) how could he refer to a time earlier than 1261 when he was an adolescent? Holobolos probably was a precocious child as others have remarked (Treu, *BZ*, V [1896], 542; Previale, *BZ*, XLII [1943–9], 6 note) but not because he was delivering orations to the emperor in his early boyhood.

152. See Pachymeres, I, p. 282, 15–18.

153. In addition to teaching and writing orations the rhetor had the

In addition, Germanos honoured the emperor with the epithet the New Constantine and hung a *peplos* representing the emperor as such in Hagia Sophia. The orations of his rhetor likewise celebrate Michael as the second founder of the city, not only by using the epithet in addressing the emperor,¹⁵⁴ but also by demonstrating Michael's qualities as a second Constantine. In fact, the first oration, with its emphasis on *peploi*, may have been intended to accompany the dedication of the *peplos* of Michael as the New Constantine.¹⁵⁵ Taken all together, Germanos' actions are indicative of an attempt to revive the old standing of the patriarchate, not only for the sake of the patriarch but also for the emperor.

Holobolos' orations, then, are part of the larger programme of restoration in the capital and mark a stage in that programme. If the arguments advanced above for the redating of the orations are accepted, the orations can help to introduce more precision into our ideas about Michael's work in the capital. All that Holobolos attributes to Michael with respect to the rebuilding and the establishment of educational facilities is not then an exaggerated assertion but a true picture of developments in the capital since 1261. Certainly what Holobolos says with regard to education indicates that he is talking about a situation which has evolved since 1261.¹⁵⁶ Likewise his description of building activity need not all refer to work begun and finished in 1261. Finally, the redating of the orations shows them to be a product of the Church's revival, without which the emperor Michael could not truly have had claim to the name the New Constantine.

University of St. Andrews

function of interpreting the Gospels. See Holobolos' *Ἑρμηνεῖα* for the emperor: ed. Treu, pp. 20–9; also Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ*, p. 568. Holobolos has the title *διδάσκαλος τῶν διδασκάλων* ascribed to him in the *lemma* to his third oration for the emperor (ed. Treu, p. 78). It is not clear whether this title is equivalent to *οἰκουμενικὸς διδάσκαλος* or *διδάσκαλος τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου*: see Darrouzès, *op. cit.*, pp. 68ff.; Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen*, pp. 57–8.

154. Ed. Treu, p. 43; p. 57; p. 84.

155. See above pp. 24, 28.

156. Ed. Treu, pp. 95–7, esp. p. 96, 4–5.